



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,554	10/18/2001	Mathias C. Zohoungbogbo	601-17c1	8007

7590 01/15/2003
SOFER & HAROUN L.L.P.
317 MADISON AVENUE
SUITE 910
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER

HUI, SAN MING R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/982,554

Applicant(s)

ZOHOUNGBOGBO, MATHIAS C.

Examiner

San-ming Hui

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This application is a continuation-in-part of US Serial No. 09/333,097, which is a continuation-in-part of US Serial No. 09/225,819.

It is recognized that applicants are claiming benefit of parent application Serial No. 09/225,819. However, there is no support found in the parent application for the claimed invention regarding the method of treating or preventing the side effect of a ketogenic diet. Please note that the teaching of this method was first taught in the parent application 09/333,097, filed June 15, 1999.

Applicant's election without traverse of the invention of Group III, claims 20, 23 (in part), 21 and 24, method of treating side effects of ketogenic diet, in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged.

The cancellation of claims 1-25 in amendments filed October 7, 2002 is acknowledged. The addition of claims 26-39, all drawn to method of treating side effects of ketogenic diet, in amendments filed October 7, 2002 is acknowledged.

Claims 26-39 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 26-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The expression, "a method of preventing and treating the side-effects of a ketogenic diet" in claim 26, line 1, renders the claims indefinite as failing to clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Examples of how and when to prevent the side-effects of a ketogenic diet are not set forth in the specification. Absent such exemplification, the skilled artisan could not establish the identity of those situations wherein prevention of the side-effects of a ketogenic diet would be effected. Furthermore, it is unclear as to the degree of prevention (e.g., total prevention, some prevention, probable prevention, total prevention in most cases...etc.) herein because the specification does not disclose the extent of prevention achieved.

Moreover, the claims herein do not recite any patient population subject to the herein claimed treatment. Without such recitation, it is not clear how the treatment method would be carried out. Examiner would favorably consider the expression such as "patient suffering from the side effect of ketogenic diet" be added into the claims.

The word "Ursodesoxycholic", recited in claim 27, line 7, is apparent misspelled as "Ursodesoxycolic".

Claim 27 recites the limitation "The method as claimed in claim 1" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 27 is depending from a cancelled claim.

The word "yohimbine", recited in claim 27, line 7, is apparent misspelled as "yohinbine".

The word "phendimetrazine", recited in claim 27, line 9, is apparent misspelled as "phendimetrazinum".

The word "triterpenes", recited in claim 27, line 4, and claim 31 is apparent misspelled as "trierpenes".

The term "global amount" in claim 29 is not understood.

The expression "said ratios including the set of:" in claims 31 and 32 renders the claims indefinite as to what other ratio, besides the one recited, are encompassed by the claims.

The word "lipolytic", recited in claim 32, line 10, is apparent misspelled as "lipolityc".

The expression of "analogue of tiroxine" in claim 32 renders the claims indefinite as to what compounds are encompassed by the claims. It is not clear what compounds are considered as analogue of tiroxine.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 26, 29, 30, 33, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marquie et al. (Life Sciences, 1998; 63(1):65-76), Pentikainen et al. (Annals of Medicine, 1990 ;22 :307-312), and Poupon et al. (Hepatology, 1993; 17(4): 577-582) in view of Spasmo-canulase® Bitab® package insert (July 1989).

Marquie et al. teaches benfluorex as useful in treating hypercholesterolemia (See abstract, also page 74, whole page).

Pentikainen et al. teaches the cholesterol lowering effect of metformin (See the abstract, also page 309, Table 2).

Poupon et al. teaches ursodesoxycholic acid as useful in lowering hypercholesterolemia (See particularly the abstract).

The references do not expressly teach the method of treating the side effects of a ketogenic diet with the combination of benfluorex, metformin and ursodesoxycholic acid. The references do not expressly teach the herein claimed amount ratio employed. The references do not expressly teach the employment of pancreatin and sodium dehydrocholate with benfluorex and metformin.

Spasmo-canulase® Bitab® package insert teaches Spasmo-canulase® Bitab® , which contains pancreatin and sodium dehydrocholate, is useful in treating abdominal cramps associated with flatulence.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to treat side effects of a ketogenic diet (hypercholesterolemia being one of the side effects of ketogenic diet) with the combination of benfluorex, metformin and ursodesoxycholic acid. Combining

Art Unit: 1617

and employing two or more agents which are known to be useful to lowering hypercholesterolemia individually into a single method useful for the very same purpose (treating hypercholesterolemia) is prima facie obvious. See *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate pancreatin and sodium dehydrocholate in the treatment method herein because Spasmo-canulase[®] Bitab[®], which contains pancreatin and sodium dehydrocholate, is known for relieving abdominal cramps associated with flatulence. Since flatulence and abdominal cramps are the common side effects of metformin, employing Spasmo-canulase[®] Bitab[®] would be reasonably expected to be effective in relieving the side effects of metformin and be useful in the herein claimed method, which utilize metformin. Furthermore, the optimization of result effect parameters (i.e., dosage range, dosing regimens) is obvious as being within the skill of the artisan.

Claims 27, 28, 31-32, 34-35, and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marquie et al., Pentikainen et al., Poupon et al., and Spasmo-canulase[®] Bitab[®] package insert as applied to claims 26, 29, 30, 33, and 36-37 above, and further in view of Hydrocotyle (A Modern Herbal Home Page, 1995), Kang et al. (Archives of Physiology and Biochemistry, 1997;105(6):603-607), Pondimin monograph (PDR, 1996, page 2066-2067), and Keown et al. (WO 95/11034).

Marquie et al., Pentikainen et al., Poupon et al., and Spasmo-canulase[®] Bitab[®] package insert suggest the method of treating side effects of ketogenic diet by employing the herein claimed agents.

The references do not expressly teach the ketogenic diet side effects treating method employing also centella asiatica triterpene, selenium, yohimbine, phendimetrazine, and fenfluramine in the herein claimed amount.

Hydrocotyle teaches that centella asiatica is known to be a mild stimulant (See the Medicinal Action and Uses Section).

Kang et al. teaches that selenium is useful as lowering cholesterol level in subject taking high fat diet (See the abstract).

Pondimin monograph teaches fenfluramine is useful in increasing glucose utilization (see pharmacology Section).

Keown et al. teaches sympathomimetic agents, such as yohimbine and phendimetrazine, as useful in increasing fat metabolism and lowering serum cholesterol level in the amount from about 0.001 to 99.90% (See particularly page 9, lines 8-16; also claim 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ all the herein claimed agents, in the herein claimed amount, into the method of treating the side effects of ketogenic diet.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ all the herein claimed agents, in the herein claimed amount, into the method of treating the side effects of ketogenic diet. All the agents herein can help relieving one of the side effects of ketogenic diet: centella asiatica, which contains the triterpene, can be useful to treat fatigue since it is a mild stimulant; selenium is useful in treating hypercholesterolemia because it can lower the cholesterol level; fenfluramine is useful

for hyperglycemia because it can increase the utilization of glucose and causing hypoglycemia; yohimbine and phendimetrazine are useful for hypercholesterolemia. One of ordinary skill in the art would know that side effects of ketogenic diets include hypercholesterolemia, hyperglycemia, hyperuricemia, fatigue, change in mental status, nausea, and vomiting. Therefore, combining and employing two or more agents which are known to be useful to treat side effects of ketogenic diet individually into a single method useful for the very same purpose is prima facie obvious. See *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069. Furthermore, the optimization of result effect parameters (i.e., dosage range, dosing regimens) is obvious as being within the skill of the artisan.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (703) 305-1002. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.


RUSSELL TRAVERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200